

### REMARKS

This Amendment is being filed in response to a final Office Action mailed April 27, 2006.

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. The title stands objected to for not being descriptive. The specification stands object to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. Claims 1, 18, 19, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1, 18, 19, and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention for using the phrase, "terminating a communications path." Claims 1-9 and 11-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Haller et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,804,558) ("Haller"). Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haller in view of Fan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,126) ("Fan"). Applicant is amending claims as listed herein above. Claim 30 is being added. Upon entry of the Amendment, claims 1-30 will be pending. No new matter is being introduced by way of the amendments.

With regard to the objection to the title, Applicant has amended the title as provided above so as to be more descriptive of the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to the title be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 18, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Applicant points to Fig. 1 showing exemplary terminals 110 (i.e., terminals 114, 116, 118, 120, 122, and 124) that are in communication with the wireless network adapter 106 and the associated description in the specification as support for the previously submitted claim amendment, "terminating a communications path." Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1, 18, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, be withdrawn.

With regard to the rejection of claims 1, 18, 19, and 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, a communications path exists between terminals 110 and the wireless network

adapter 106, as shown in Fig. 1. Since a terminal terminates a communications path, Applicant respectfully submits the term "terminating a communications path" within claim 1 ("at least one wired local port and at least one wireless local port configured to establish bi-directional communications with at least one respective local device terminating a communications path" is supported and requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Remarks Regarding Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claim 1 as amended in the Claim Listing above recites:

a multiplexer in communication with said processing system to multiplex the converted data signals from the at least two of the local terminal ports to communicate data of the local terminals simultaneously via said remote access port to the service provider

Support for the claim amendment can be found in the specification as originally filed at page 15, first paragraph (lines 1-9):

That is, where a particular number of devices are sharing a connection, and the air interface can accommodate that particular number of logic channels in a single physical layer connection (e.g., a frequency divided into logical channels using, for example, time-division multiple access, code division multiple access, orthogonal frequency division multiplexing, or other statistical or frequency multiple access techniques), then each device may be mapped to a logical channel of the air interface and the devices may simultaneously communicate data through the connection.

Referring to Fig. 5, a multiplexer 510 combines data from the terminals 110 (Fig. 1) and transmits the data simultaneously to a network communications unit (NCU). The multiplexer 510 thus transmits the data simultaneously between the wireless network adapter 106 and the network communications unit via a remote access port 108 (Fig. 1).

Haller discloses multiplexers 84 (Fig. 3) and 55 (Fig. 5). The multiplexer 84 of Fig. 3 digitizes analog signals and voltages to provide "real-time" telemetry intracardiac signals and battery end-of-life replacement functions (Col. 12, lines 31-34). The example implantable medical device (IMD) 10 of Fig. 3 thus is able to provide data related to a heart 8 and other data,

such as data related to a battery, but only data of one IMD 10 is multiplexed by the multiplexer 84 of Fig. 3. The multiplexer 55 of Fig. 5 multiplexes signals from electrodes selected for coupling to a bandpass amplifier 49 and thereafter converted to multi-bit digital signals by an A/D converter 57 for storage in random access memory 59 (Col. 15, lines 32-36). The data is stored in memory rather than transmitted, and the data is for a single IMD rather than multiple IMD's. Haller discloses multiple IMD's 10, 10', 10'', 10''' in Fig. 8, but does not disclose a multiplexer or other device in the communications module 100 or mobile telephone 110 to allow data from the IMD's to be communicated simultaneously to a remote communication system 120 and remote computer system 130. Applicant notes that the statement by Haller in col. 22, lines 23-26 in which he states that parallel communications protocols may be used is with respect to serial communications protocols, such as RS-232, and does not refer to transmitting data from multiple IMD's simultaneously.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 as now amended distinguishes over Haller and requests the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-9 and 11-17, which depend from claim 1, should be allowable for at least the same reasons and Applicant respectfully request that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn for these claims.

Independent claims 18, 19, and 23 have been similarly amended as claim 1 and should be allowable for the same reasons. Dependent claims 20-22 and 24-25, 26-27, and 28-29, which depend from amended independent claims 1, 19, and 23, respectively, should be allowable for at least the same reasons.

#### Remarks Regarding Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haller in view of Fan et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,815,126) ("Fan").

The present Office Action states that "the Fan reference teaches a wearable computer including at least one of a wearable eyeglass computer or a wearable audio computer in order to provide the advantage of allowing the user to see or hear voice or video data." Since Fan does

not provide for the deficiency of Haller with respect to the limitations of amended claim 1 ("to communicate data of the local terminals simultaneously via said remote access port"), Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection of claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) has been overcome.

Claim 30, which depends from claim 1, is being added. Support for this claim is recited above and can be found in the specification as originally filed at page 15, first paragraph (line 1-9). This claim should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 1.

#### Conclusion


In view of the above, it is believed that the application is in order for issuance. Should the Examiner have any further questions or comments, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicant's representative at the phone number provided below.

A check in the amount of \$25 for excess claim fees, a check in the amount of \$395 for the Request for Continued Examination filing fee, and a check in the amount of \$225 for the Petition for Two-Month Extension of Time are enclosed. Applicant believes no further fees are due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayments to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

9/26/06

  
Joshua A. Griswold  
Reg. No. 46,310

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
1717 Main Street  
Suite 5000  
Dallas, Texas 75201  
Telephone: (214) 292-4034  
Facsimile: (214) 747-2091